



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,539	02/20/2004	Marie D. Radatti	E-2624	7445
7590 07/27/2010 Harding, Earley, Follmer & Frailey 86 The Commons at Valley Forge East 1288 Valley Forge Road PO Box 750 Valley Forge, PA 19482-0750				
EXAMINER				
BECKER, DREW E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1782				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/27/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,539

Applicant(s)

RADATTI ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E. Becker

Art Unit

1782

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4, 7-15, 32 and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-31, 34-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/7/10 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 1-4, 7-15, and 32-33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/6/07.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 16-31, 34-37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The application does not appear to disclose the newly added limitations to claims 16, 26, 29, 31, and 36 regarding the removal of the shell from the fryer, and the food from the shell. The only passage found in the application related to food removal is a single sentence on page 5 which states: "When the dough is cooked to the extent desired, shell 10 is removed from the oil, opened, and the now cooked doughnut removed".

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 16-31, 34-37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claims 16, 26, 29, 31, and 36 recite "removing the cooked food from the shell that approximates the shell configuration". It is not clear what is meant by this phrase. It is not clear if the shell should have a "shell configuration", or if the food should have a "shell configuration". It is not clear what a "shell configuration" is. Should the food be molded by the inner chamber of the shell? Should the food resemble the outer shape of the shell?

8. Claims 16, 26, 29, 31, and 36 recite:

"wherein removing said cooked food from said shell includes lifting said first shell plate from said second shell plate, wherein said first shell plate

and said second shell plate remain connected to one another during said lifting,”

as well as

“and wherein removing the cooked food comprises independently moving one of the first shell plate and the second shell plate relative to the other of the first shell plate and the second shell plate to remove the cooked food from the shell, wherein the cooked food of a shell is independently removable from said shell relative to each other cooked food item”.

It is not clear whether these are alternative methods of removing the food, or not. The two methods appear to differ in scope since the first method requires lifting the first plate up from the second plate, while the second method only requires moving one of the two plates relative to the other. The second method refers to “a shell”. It is not clear whether this is the shell previously mentioned in the claim, or a new shell. The second method recites “wherein the cooked food of a shell is independently removable from said shell relative to each other cooked food item”. It is not clear whether the claim requires plural cooked food items in a single shell, or whether it requires plural shells for plural food products. It is not clear what is meant by the phrase “independently removable... relative to each other cooked food item”. Does this simply require removing one food item at a time, rather than simultaneously?

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 16-21, 26-31, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morley [Pat. No. 1,663,719] in view of Guyon et al [Pat. No. 2,244,193].

Morley teaches a method for cooking doughnuts by providing a shell having first and second plates which are hingeably connected (Figure 1, E-G), the plates having a groove (Figure 1, C), the plates having an outer edge where the hinge is located (Figure 1, G), the plates having an inner radial edge surrounding the groove (Figure 1, C), opening the shell and extruding a dough into the groove (Figure 1, A-B), closing the shell and cooking the dough (page 1, line 94), then cooking and shaping the dough to approximate the inner shape of the groove by use of a heat source of any suitable manner (Figure 1; page 2, line 3), and finally opening the shell by lifting the first plate while it remains hingeably connected to the bottom pate and removing the food items (Figure 1; page 2, line 17).

Morley does not recite inserting the shell into a fryer and submerging it, using oil at 325-375°F, providing at least two shells, and the shell being heavy enough to sink. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use plural shells of Morley simultaneously since this provided a greater production rate for the doughnuts, thus

reducing the waiting time for the consumers, and since cooking systems commonly used plural food holding members simultaneously, such as fryer baskets.

Guyon et al teach a method for cooking foods within a shell (Figure 1) wherein the shell is submerged within a fryer (Figure 3) and the oil is maintained at 375-425°F (column 2, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the fryer heat source of Guyon et al into the method of Morley since both are directed to methods of cooking foods within shells, since Morley already included the use of any suitable heat source (page 2, line 2), since hot oil was a commonly used heat source for food within shells as shown by Guyon et al (Figure 3), since the surrounding oil of Guyon et al was well known to provide quicker and more even heating of food as compared to conventional oven heating (column 1, lines 6-15). It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the shell of Morley with sufficient weight for it to sink in the fryer of Guyon et al since Morley already taught modifying the shape and dimensions of the shell (page 1, lines 97-102), since the metal shell of Morley would almost certainly sink in a cooking liquid due to its greater density than the cooking liquid, and since this would have ensured complete coverage of the surrounding hot oil of Guyon et al around the shell of Morley.

In conclusion, it would have been obvious to incorporate the oil heating medium of Guyon et al into the method of Morley since the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

11. Claims 16-20, 26-30, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcox [Pat. No. 1,638,673] in view of Guyon et al [Pat. No. 2,244,193].

Wilcox teaches a method for cooking doughnuts by providing a shell having first and second plates which are hingeably connected (Figure 1, #1-2), the plates having a groove (Figure 1, #3), the plates having an outer edge where the hinge is located (Figure 1, #4 & 7), the plates having an inner radial edge surrounding the groove (Figure 1, #3), opening the shell and placing food into the groove (page 1, line 86), and then closing the shell and cooking the food (page 1, line 90) wherein the food approximates the shape of the groove to form a doughnut shape (Figure 1; page 1, line 92).

Wilcox does not specifically recite opening the shell by lifting the top plate and removing the food, inserting the shell into a fryer and submerging it, using oil at 325-375°F, providing at least two shells, and the shell being heavy enough to sink. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use plural shells of Wilcox simultaneously since this provided a greater production rate for the doughnuts, thus reducing the waiting time for the consumers, and since fryers commonly used plural food holding members simultaneously, such as fryer baskets. Although not specifically recited, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to open the shell by lifting the top plate and removing the food in the method of Wilcox since Wilcox simply did not describe how the food was removed, since Wilcox teaches opening the shell in

this manner in order to insert the food (page 1, line 87), and since this the shell of Wilcox already possessed hinges (Figure 1, #4) to permit this manner of food removal.

Guyon et al teach a method for cooking foods within a shell (Figure 1) wherein the shell is submerged within a fryer (Figure 3) and the oil is maintained at 375-425°F (column 2, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the fryer heat source of Guyon et al into the method of Wilcox since both are directed to methods of cooking foods within shells, since Wilcox already taught other sources of heat (page 1, line 19), since hot oil was a commonly used heat source for food within shells as shown by Guyon et al (Figure 3), since the surrounding oil of Guyon et al was well known to provide quicker and more even heating of food as compared to conventional oven heating (column 1, lines 6-15), and since this would have eliminated the need for turning as required by Wilcox (page 1, line 98). It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the shell of Wilcox with sufficient weight for it to sink in the fryer of Guyon et al since the metal shell of Wilcox would almost certainly sink in a cooking liquid due to its greater density than the cooking liquid, and since this would have ensured complete coverage of the surrounding hot oil of Guyon et al around the shell of Wilcox.

In conclusion, it would have been obvious to incorporate the oil heating medium of Guyon et al into the method of Wilcox since the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

12. Claims 16-21, 26-30, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing [Pat. No. 3,727,875] in view of Bedel [Des. 77,875] and Guyon et al [Pat. No. 2,244,193].

Downing teaches a method for cooking doughnuts by providing a shell having first and second plates (Figures 1-3, #10-11), the plates having a groove (Figure 1, #12), the plates having an outer edge and an inner radial edge surrounding the groove (Figure 1, #12), opening the shell and placing food into the groove, then closing the shell and cooking the food (column 1, line 29 to column 2, line 2), and removing the cooked donuts by lifting up the top plate and removing the cooked donut with a fork (column 2, line 8).

Downing does not recite a hinge, inserting the shell into a fryer and submerging it, using oil at 325-375°F, providing at least two shells, and the shell being heavy enough to sink. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use plural shells of Downing simultaneously since this provided a greater production rate for the doughnuts, thus reducing the waiting time for the consumers, and since fryers commonly used plural food holding members simultaneously, such as fryer baskets.

Bedel teaches a doughnut mold comprising two plates hinged together along the outer edge (Figures 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the hinge of Bedel into the invention of Downing since both are directed to methods of making doughnuts, and since the hinge of Bedel would have ensured more

precise alignment of the grooves of Downing while also providing an easier means for opening and closing the plates.

Guyon et al teach a method for cooking foods within a shell (Figure 1) wherein the shell is submerged within a fryer (Figure 3) and the oil is maintained at 375-425°F (column 2, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the fryer heat source of Guyon et al into the method of Downing, in view of Bedel, since all are directed to methods of cooking foods within shells, since Downing simply did not specify the particular heat source to be used, since Downing preferred baking (column 1, line 1), since Guyon et al taught baking via submersion in oil (column 2, line 30), since hot oil was a commonly used heat source for food within shells as shown by Guyon et al (Figure 3), and since the surrounding oil of Guyon et al was well known to provide quicker and more even heating of food as compared to conventional oven heating (column 1, lines 6-15). It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the shell of Downing with sufficient weight for it to sink in the fryer of Guyon et al since the metal shell of Downing would almost certainly sink in a cooking liquid due to its greater density than the cooking liquid, and since this would have ensured complete coverage of the surrounding hot oil of Guyon et al around the shell of Downing.

In conclusion, it would have been obvious to incorporate the oil heating medium of Guyon et al into the method of Downing since the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

13. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing, in view of Guyon et al and Bedel, as applied above, and further in view of Morley.

Downing, Guyon et al, and Bedel teach the abovementioned concepts. Downing, Guyon et al, and Bedel do not recite extruding dough into the groove. Morley teaches a method for making donuts by extruding dough into a groove (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the extruded dough of Morley into the invention of Downing, in view of Guyon et al and Bedel, since all are directed to methods of making foods, since Downing already included donut dough, and since extrusion was a commonly practiced and efficient means for placing dough into the groove as shown by Morley

14. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morley, in view of Guyon et al, as applied above, and further in view of Aurio et al [20060099324] and Young et al [Pat. No. 6,048,564].

Morley and Guyon et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Morley and Guyon et al do not recite the dough having konjac glucomannan, animal-based protein concentrate, and baking powder. Aurio et al teach a dough product comprising konjac glucomannan (paragraph 0024) and animal-based protein concentrate (paragraph 0033) as well as mixing (paragraph 0085) which naturally would have provided aeration of the mixture. Young et al teach a method for making dough comprising konjac glucomannan (column 4, lines 29-49) and baking powder (column 17, line 37). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the konjac glucomannan, animal-based protein concentrate, and baking powder of Aurio et al and Young et al into the invention of Morley, in view of Guyon et al, since all are directed to methods of making food, since Morley already included dough as the food, since Aurio et al teach that konjac glucomannan (paragraph 0024) and animal-based protein concentrate (paragraph 0033) were commonly used in conjunction in food, since Young et al teach that doughs containing konjac glucomannan commonly had baking powder to provide leavening (column 17, line 37), and since all of these ingredients were commonly used in doughs in order to provide the desired taste, texture, and aroma.

15. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing, in view of Bedel and Guyon et al, as applied above, and further in view of Aurio et al [20060099324] and Young et al [Pat. No. 6,048,564].

Downing, Bedel, and Guyon et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Downing, Bedel, and Guyon et al do not recite the dough having konjac glucomannan, animal-based protein concentrate, and baking powder. Aurio et al teach a dough product comprising konjac glucomannan (paragraph 0024) and animal-based protein concentrate (paragraph 0033) as well as mixing (paragraph 0085) which naturally would have provided aeration of the mixture. Young et al teach a method for making dough comprising konjac glucomannan (column 4, lines 29-49) and baking powder (column 17, line 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the konjac glucomannan, animal-based protein concentrate, and baking powder of Aurio et al and Young et al into the invention of Downing, in view of Bedel and Guyon et al, since

all are directed to methods of making food, since Downing already included dough as the food, since Aurio et al teach that konjac glucomannan (paragraph 0024) and animal-based protein concentrate (paragraph 0033) were commonly used in conjunction in food, since Young et al teach that doughs containing konjac glucomannan commonly had baking powder to provide leavening (column 17, line 37), and since all of these ingredients were commonly used in doughs in order to provide the desired taste, texture, and aroma.

16. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morley, in view of Guyon et al, as applied above, and further in view of Roberts et al [Pat. No. 5,359,924].

Morley and Guyon et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Morley and Guyon et al do not recite linked shells. Roberts et al teach a method for molding and cooking dough by use of linked shells (Figures 4-5, #34 & 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the links of Roberts et al into the invention of Morley, in view of Guyon et al, since all are directed to methods of cooking and molding foods, since plural shells of Morley would have provided an increased production rate as well as providing greater flexibility in the amount and timing of the cooked foods, and since the links of Roberts et al provided a simple and efficient means for connecting plural shells and thereby ensuring that the foods are cooked to an equal degree.

17. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing, in view of Bedel and Guyon et al, as applied above, and further in view of Roberts et al [Pat. No. 5,359,924].

Downing, Bedel, and Guyon et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Downing, Bedel, and Guyon et al do not recite linked shells. Roberts et al teach a method for molding and cooking dough by use of linked shells (Figures 4-5, #34 & 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the links of Roberts et al into the invention of Downing, in view of Bedel and Guyon et al, since all are directed to methods of cooking and molding foods, since plural shells of Downing would have provided an increased production rate as well as providing greater flexibility in the amount and timing of the cooked foods, and since the links of Roberts et al provided a simple and efficient means for connecting plural shells and thereby ensuring that the foods are cooked to an equal degree.

18. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morley, in view of Guyon et al and Roberts et al, as applied above, and further in view of Remley [Pat. No. 3,007,595].

Morley, Roberts et al, and Guyon et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Morley, Roberts et al, and Guyon et al do not recite a c-shaped linkage and pin linkage. Remley teaches a method for cooking foods by use of a shell with linkages comprising a c-shaped linkage and pin linkage (Figures 6-7, #37 & 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the c and pin linkages of Remley into the invention of Morley, in view of Guyon et al and Roberts et al, since all are directed to methods of cooking in shells, since Roberts et al already taught linking shells and using any type of linking means (column 4, line 24), and since the c and pin linkages of

Remley provided a simple and effective means for linking cooking components (column 3, lines 3-43).

19. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing, in view of Guyon et al, Bedel, and Roberts et al, as applied above, and further in view of Remley [Pat. No. 3,007,595].

Downing, Roberts et al, Bedel, and Guyon et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Downing, Roberts et al, Bedel, and Guyon et al do not recite a c-shaped linkage and pin linkage. Remley teaches a method for cooking foods by use of a shell with linkages comprising a c-shaped linkage and pin linkage (Figures 6-7, #37 & 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the c and pin linkages of Remley into the invention of Downing, in view of Guyon et al, Bedel, and Roberts et al, since all are directed to methods of cooking in shells, since Roberts et al already taught linking shells and using any type of linking means (column 4, line 24), and since the c and pin linkages of Remley provided a simple and effective means for linking cooking components (column 3, lines 3-43).

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 6/7/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that Guyon et al do not teach removing the food by lifting the top plate and removing the food while the plates remain connected. However, this concept is taught by the various primary references of Morley, Wilcox, and Downing in view of Bedel as described above.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a shell which permits opening and removal of a food item, while another section of the same shell remains closed) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that the references do not teach opening one shell, while another shell remains closed. However, the use of plural shells is addressed in paragraphs 9-11 of the above rejection. Furthermore, it is not clear whether all of the independent claims require plural shells.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., opening one shell to remove a food, while a second shell remains closed) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that providing linked shells of Downing would be “cumbersome” and also that Downing already included plural mold recesses. However, the use of linked shells was clearly taught by Roberts et al as described above and would have provide many advantages, such as providing a means for the user to select how many mold recesses were to be used at a time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Drew E Becker/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1782